

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

# PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY  
EXAMINING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 66)

To:

OKABE Masaso  
No.602, Fuji Bldg., 2-3  
Marunouchi 3-chome, Chiyoda-  
ku, Tokyo 100-0005

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year)

08.03.2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
**CFO17897WO**

**REPLY DUE** within **2 months** from  
the above date of mailing

International application No.

**PCT/JP2004/001425**

International filing date (day/month/year)

**10.02.2004**

Priority date (day/month/year)

**14.02.2003**

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Int.Cl. **G06F3/12, G06T1/00, G09C1/00, G09C5/00, H04L9/00, H04N1/00**

Applicant

**CANON KABUSHIKI KAISHA**

1. ☒ The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority:

☒ is ☐ is not

considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This 2nd (first, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

**When?** See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(e).

**How?** By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

**Also** For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.  
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis.  
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: **14.06.2005**

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/JP

**Japan Patent Office**

3-4-3, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8915, Japan

Authorized officer

**SATOSHI KONDO**

Telephone No. +81-3-3581-1101 Ext. 3520

**5E 8730**

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP 2004/001425

Box No. 1 Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

- ☐ This opinion is based on a translation from the original language into the following language \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:
- ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
  - ☐ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
  - ☐ international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of *(replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed.")*:

- ☐ the international application as originally filed/furnished
- ☒ the description:  
pages 1 - 53 \_\_\_\_\_ as originally filed/furnished  
pages \_\_\_\_\_ received by this Authority on \_\_\_\_\_  
pages \_\_\_\_\_ received by this Authority on \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ the claims:  
pages 3 - 5, 7, 10 - 16 \_\_\_\_\_ as originally filed/furnished  
pages \_\_\_\_\_ as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19  
pages 1, 2, 6, 8, 9 received by this Authority on 10.09.2004  
pages \_\_\_\_\_ received by this Authority on \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ the drawings:  
pages 1 - 28 \_\_\_\_\_ as originally filed/furnished  
pages \_\_\_\_\_ received by this Authority on \_\_\_\_\_  
pages \_\_\_\_\_ received by this Authority on \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.

3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ the claims, Nos. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ the sequence listing (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

4. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

- ☐ the description, pages \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ the claims, Nos. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ the sequence listing (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/001425

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-16	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-16	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-16	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

Document1.EP 1197828 A1(Trustcopy Pte Ltd) 2002.04.17  
& JP 2002-169681 A & US 2002/0042884 A1 & WO 02/32047 A1

Document2.JP 2002-156903 A(Hitachi Seisakusyo Ltd.)2002.05.31  
(Family:none)

Document3.JP 11-154139 A(Fujitsu LTD.)1999.06.08  
(Family:none)

The subject matter of claims 1-16 does not involve an inventive step over Document1 (see Paragraph[0052]-[0064]) cited in the ISR in view of new Document2(see Abstract), new Document3(see Abstract, Paragraph[0025]-[0027]).

The person skilled in the art would easily conceive the idea of applying the technical feature "the authentication server" employed in Document2, "the monitor table (2c)" employed in Document3 to the invention disclosed in Document1.